UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,174	08/13/2001	Brian Minear	010239	8995

23696 7590 12/23/2005

QUALCOMM, INC
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
WEST, LEWIS G	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2682	

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/929,174	MINEAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lewis G. West	2682	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 October 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6-14,17-24 and 26-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3,4,6-14,17-24 and 26-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 August 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed October 17, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Coley clearly addresses storing licensing information at the user terminal. See at least column 9 lines 41-51, previously cited by Examiner Persino as showing licensing information installed in memory. The remainder of applicant's arguments are a restatement of claims, and therefore not persuasive to overcome any rejections.

All arguments have therefore been addressed, as the remainder of applicant's remarks are a restatement of claim language; therefore this action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4, 10, 14, 17, 22-24, 26, 31, 34-42 and 44-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COLEY et al (US 5,790,664 A) in view of RYDBECK et al (US 6,195,564 B1).

Regarding claim 1, COLEY et al discloses a system for controlling software applications on one or more devices, comprising: an application managing server (110 of figure 1) operable to receive a license request (212 of figure 2) transmitted from a device (100 of figure 1) across a network (116 of figure 1), wherein the license request is generated upon each attempted

execution of a software application resident on the device (200-208 of figure 2), and the application managing server further operable, based upon the license request, to selectively initiate a transmission (220 of figure 2) across the network of a license installable by the device (228 of figure 2), the license providing for an execution of a the resident software application (230 of figure 2) (also see column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 4, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses that the application managing server further comprises a data store having a record associating license-related data, software application-related data, and wireless device-related data (column 8 lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 10, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. RYDBECK et al further discloses the wireless device is a cellular telephone (figures 1, 2 and column 1 lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 14, COLEY et al discloses a method for controlling software applications on a device, comprising: sending (210 of figure 2), upon each attempted execution

of a resident software application without a valid license on the device (200 and 202 of figure 2), a prompt across a network to an application managing server, the prompt requesting transmission of a license; receiving the license for the resident software application from across the network (220 of figure 2); and installing (228 of figure 2) the license on the device such that the resident software application is executable (230 of figure 2) (also see column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 17, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. RYDBECK et al further discloses that the receiving of the license for the resident software application from across the wireless network further comprises receiving the license upon the direction of the application managing server if a license exists for the wireless device to execute the software application (column 9 lines 1-41).

Regarding claim 22, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. RYDBECK et al further discloses that the receiving of the license for the resident software application from across the wireless network further comprises receiving a

copy of [[a]] the license for the software application of the wireless device held at the application managing server (column 9 lines 1-41).

Regarding claim 23, COLEY et al discloses a method for controlling software applications on a device, comprising: a sending step (210 of figure 2) for sending, upon each attempted execution of a resident software application without a valid license installed on the device (200 and 202 of figure 2), a license request (208 of figure 2) across a network to an application managing server, the license request requesting transmission of a license; a receiving step (212 of figure 2) for receiving the license from across the network; and an installing step (228 of figure 2) for installing the license on the device such that the resident software application can be executed (230 of figure 2) (also see column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 24, COLEY et al discloses a device, comprising: a resident software application (102 of figure 1) selectively executable (200 of figure 2) on the device (300 of figure 3); and a computer platform (302 of figure 3) operable to receive an execution request generated upon each upon the attempted execution of a the resident software application (212 of figure 2),

the computer platform, based upon the received execution request and a lack of a valid license on the device, operable to transmit a license request across a network to an application managing server requesting transmission of a license, the computer platform operable to receive from across the network the license, and the computer platform operable to install the license on the device such that the resident software application is executable (column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51 and column 10 line 57 to column 11 line 25). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 26, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses a memory, wherein the wireless device stores in the memory the license for execution of a specific software application on the wireless device (column 9 lines 41-51).

Regarding claim 31, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. RYDBECK et al further discloses the wireless device is a cellular telephone (figures 1, 2 and column 1 lines 39-49).

Regarding claim 34, COLEY et al discloses a computer readable medium, a program that directs a device (100 of figure 1) to perform the steps of: sending (210 of figure 2), upon each

attempted execution (200 of figure 2) of a resident software application without a valid license on the device (102 of figure 1), a license request (208 of figure 2) across a network (116 of figure 2) to an application managing server (110 of figure 1) requesting transmission of a software application license; receiving the software application license from across the network (220 of figure 2); and installing (228 of figure 2) the software application license on the device such that the resident software application is executable (230 of figure 2) (also see column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 35, COLEY et al discloses a device (100 of figure 1) in selective communication with a network (116 of figure 2), comprising: a selectively executable resident software application without a valid license on the device (102 of figure 1); logic configured to detect an attempt to execute the resident software application (200 of figure 2); logic configured, in response to each detected attempt to execute the resident software application, to transmit (210 of figure 2) a license request via the network to an application managing server (110 of figure 1), the license request requesting transmission of a corresponding license; logic configured to receive (220 of figure 2) the corresponding license over the network; and logic configured to

install the corresponding license on the device such that the resident software application is executable (230 of figure 2) (also see column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 36, COLEY et al discloses a computer readable medium for controlling software applications, comprising: at least one sequence of instructions, wherein execution of the instructions by a processor causes the processor to perform the steps of: receiving (212 of figure 2), upon each attempted execution (200 of figure 2) of a software application without a valid license installed in the device (102 of figure 1) resident on a device (100 of figure 1), a license request (208 of figure 2) from across a network (116 of figure 1), the license request requesting transmission of a software application license; and initiating a transmission (220 of figure 2) across the network of the software application license to the device, the software application license installable on the device and providing for an execution (230 of figure 2) of the software application on the device (also see column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure

1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 37, COLEY et al discloses an apparatus for controlling software applications, comprising: a processing means; and an instruction means, executable by the processing means, for causing the processor to perform the steps of: receiving (212 of figure 2), upon each attempted execution (200 of figure 2) of a software application without a valid license installed in the device (102 of figure 1) resident on a device (100 of figure 1), a license request (208 of figure 2) from across a network (116 of figure 1), the license request requesting transmission of a software application license; and initiating a transmission (220 of figure 2) across the network of the software application license to the device, the software application license installable on the device and providing for an execution (230 of figure 2) of the software application on the device (also see column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become

mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 38, COLEY et al discloses a method for controlling software applications, comprising: receiving (212 of figure 2), upon each attempted execution (200 of figure 2) of a software application (102 of figure 1) resident on a device without a valid license installed in the device (100 of figure 1), a license request (208 of figure 2) from across a network (116 of figure 1), the license request requesting transmission of a software application license; and initiating a transmission (220 of figure 2) across the network of the software application license to the device, the software application license installable on the device and providing for an execution (230 of figure 2) of the software application on the device (also see column 7 line 43 to column 9 line 51). However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the device and network is a wireless device and network. RYDBECK et al discloses computing devices that use a wireless connection for the network connection (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the COLEY et al's computing devices to use a wireless connection for the network connection. Motivation to modify COLEY et al's computing devices to operate on a wireless network is that it allows the devices to become mobile. This is useful in that the user of the device can operate the device at any location of his/her choosing.

Regarding claim 39, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses transmitting a prompt to purchase a new license to the wireless device if the software application license has expired or is not associated with the wireless device (column 10 line 57 to column 11 line 25).

Regarding claim 40, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses receiving an authorization to retrieve the new license (column 10 line 57 to column 11 line 25).

Regarding claim 41, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses receiving billing information associated with a payment for the new license (column 10 line 57 to column 11 line 25).

Regarding claim 42, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses that the software application license has a finite duration (column 9 lines 41-51 and column 10 lines 6-27).

Regarding claim 44, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses storing a record associating license-related data, software application-related data, and wireless device-related data. (column 8 lines 1-15).

Regarding claim 45, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses initiating of the transmission across the wireless network of the software application license to the wireless device further comprises directing another server on the wireless network to transmit the license to the wireless device (column 10 line 57 to column 11 line 25).

Regarding claim 46, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses that the application managing server is further operable to transmit a prompt to purchase a new license to the wireless device if the

software application license has expired or is not associated with the wireless device (column 8 lines 36-53 and column 10 lines 5-41).

Regarding claim 47, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses that the application managing server is further operable to receive an authorization to retrieve the new license (column 8 lines 36-53 and column 10 lines 5-41).

Regarding claim 48, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses that the application managing server is further operable to receive billing information associated with a payment for the new license (column 8 lines 36-53 and column 10 lines 5-41).

Regarding claim 49, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. COLEY et al further discloses that the application managing server is further operable to direct another server on the wireless network to transmit the license to the wireless device (column 10 line 57 to column 11 line 25).

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COLEY et al (US 5,790,664 A) in view of RYDBECK et al (US 6,195,564 B1) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of PUHL et al (US 6,223,291 B1).

Regarding claim 3, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim depends upon. However, COLEY et al does not disclose that the application managing server else further comprises a data store having a plurality of software applications and a corresponding plurality of licenses, the application managing server further operable to

selectively download selected ones of the plurality of software applications and the corresponding ones of the plurality of licenses to predetermined wireless devices over the wireless network. PUHL et al discloses that the application managing server else further comprises a data store having a plurality of software applications and a corresponding plurality of licenses, the application managing server further operable to selectively download selected ones of the plurality of software applications and the corresponding ones of the plurality of licenses to predetermined wireless devices over the wireless network (column 6 lines 17-39 and column 7 lines 25-43). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have application managing server else further comprises a data store having a plurality of software applications for download to the wireless device. Secure electronic commerce offers a way for customers to add or change features in their phone using the convenience of the wireless data service already available in the phone. Moreover, the customer can achieve these goals within minutes and in the comfort of the customer's home or business. Secure electronic commerce offers many advantages, among them: greater ease of distribution, sale and revenue collection for software-only features; flexible and upgradeable phone platform - this reduces obsolescence; ability to thwart theft of services and cloning; reduced warranty costs in case of software patch updates; and convenience of wireless reprogramming.

4. Claims 6-9, 18-21, 27-30 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COLEY et al (US 5,790,664 A) in view of RYDBECK et al (US 6,195,564

B1) as above, and further in view of an examiner's official notice evidenced by HERSHEY et al (US 4,924,378 A), WOLF (US 5,673,315 A) and DANIELI (US 6,510,513 B1).

Regarding claims 6-9, 18-21, 27-30 and 43 see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. COLEY et al suggests finite duration licenses but does not do so with detail (column 9 lines 41-51 and column 10 lines 6-27). Nevertheless the examiner takes official notice that is was known in the art at the time the invention was made to issue licenses of a) a finite duration and expires on a fixed date; b) wherein the license expires after a predetermined number of executions of the software application on the wireless device; c) wherein the license is of a finite duration and expires after the elapse of a predetermined duration since the software application was downloaded to the wireless device; and d) wherein the license is of a finite duration and expires after the elapse of a predetermined duration of usage of the software application. Moreover, Hershey et al evidences that it is known for a license to expire either on a fixed date or after a predetermined amount of time after installation (column 5 line 62 to column 6 line 6). Also, Wolf evidences that it is known for a license to expire after a period of usage (column 2 lines 1-14). In addition, Danieli evidences that it is known for a license to expire after a number of executions (column 20 lines 22-38). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a license of finite duration. The most significant advantage of a license of finite duration is that it could be provided to a user at a reduced cost thus allowing a user to need to only pay for his/her use of the application.

5. Claims 11, 12, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COLEY et al (US 5,790,664 A) in view of RYDBECK et al (US 6,195,564 B1) as above, and further in view of an examiner's official notice.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. RYDBECK et al suggests that the client device is a wireless device (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). However, RYDBECK et al does not specifically indicate that the wireless device is a personal digital assistant or a pager. Nevertheless, the examiner takes official notice that it was well known at the time the invention was made that a personal digital assistant can be a wireless device and that a pager is a wireless device. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a license of finite duration. Allowing a PDA for pager to be used with the invention of COLEY et al in view of RYDBECK et al will enhance the teaching by expanding the number and type of devices that the teaching can be used with.

Regarding claims 32 and 33, see the rejection of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. RYDBECK et al suggests that the client device is a wireless device (figure 1 and column 1 lines 39-49). However, RYDBECK et al does not specifically indicate that the wireless device is a personal digital assistant or a pager. Nevertheless, the examiner takes official notice that it was well known at the time the invention was made that a personal digital assistant can be a wireless device and that a pager is a wireless device. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a license of finite duration. Allowing a PDA for pager to be

used with the invention of COLEY et al in view of RYDBECK et al will enhance the teaching by expanding the number and type of devices that the teaching can be used with.

6. Claim 13 (per the claim as filed), is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PUHL et al (US 6,223,291 B1) in view of WAITE et al (US 5,103,476 A).

Regarding claim 13 (per the claim as filed), PUHL et al discloses a system for controlling software applications on a wireless network (19 of fig 1), comprising: wireless communication means (11 of fig 1) for selectively communicating with a wireless network and having one or more resident software applications selectively executable thereon, at least one software application requiring a license for execution of the software application, and upon the start up of the wireless device, the wireless communication means determining if a license is present to execute the software application; software application managing means for managing software applications on one or more wireless communication means, the software application managing means selectively in communication across the wireless network with the wireless communication means and selectively providing a license for the use of a software application; and wherein, upon a license not being present, the wireless communication means selectively prompting the software application managing means for transmission of a license, receiving the transmitted license, and installing the license on the wireless communication means such that the licensed software application is executable (column 6 lines 17-39 and column 7 lines 45-61). However, PUHL et al does not teach the software application requiring a license for each execution of the software application, and upon the attempted execution of a software application, the wireless device determining if a license is present to execute the software

application. In other words, PUHL et al teaches that the wireless device checks for licenses at its startup instead of at each execution of the software. Nevertheless, WAITE et al discloses licenses being checked at each execution of software (column 2 line 36 to column 3 line 8 and column 4 lines 8-68). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement WAITE et al's tamperproof overlay in PUHL et al's teaching. This modification would enhance PUHL et al's teaching by preventing license abuse after activation (see WAITE et al, column 4 lines 49-68).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hasebe et al (US 5,935,243) is also relevant as teaching updating and installing licensing information on a remote user terminal.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis G. West whose telephone number is 571-272-7859. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Quochien B. Vuong can be reached on 571-272-7902. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lewis West
(571) 272-7859

DORIS H. TO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600